

REMARKS

In response to the Official Action dated September 25, 2003, Applicants amend their application and request reconsideration. In this Amendment, claim 16 is added and no claims are canceled so that claims 1-16 remain pending. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1 and 15 are amended to clarify that the software module is automatically linked to the development means based on information stored on the object (see pages 23, lines 13-23 of the patent application). Thus, the user can easily use the software module to control the object when developing programs for the object. Claim 1 is further amended to delete the limitation relating to the icon procedure. Claim 16 is added to recite the icon procedure limitation deleted from amended claim 1. Other amendments are made to claim 1 for clarity of language. Claims 8 and 13 are amended to ensure clear antecedent basis for all claim terms.

The Official Action rejected claims 1-2, 4-12, and 15 as unpatentable over Carlson et al. (US Patent 5,623,592, hereinafter Carlson) in view of Takizawa et al. (US Patent 5,565,748, hereinafter Takizawa). That rejection is respectfully traversed.

Regarding examined claims 1 and 15, the Official Action asserts that the software module providing one of an icon procedure, a description procedure, and an implementing procedure would be obvious to one skilled in the art. Applicants respectfully traverse that assertion. Because the Official Action provides no support for that assertion, Applicants respectfully request that support be provided in the next Official Action if the rejection is maintained.

Furthermore, regarding amended claims 1 and 15, the combination of Carlson and Takizawa fails to teach or suggest a software module uniquely assigned to an object, wherein the software module is automatically linked to a development means based on information stored on the object. Carlson teaches that the device icons in the experiment design window 200 (development means) do not correspond to a specific external device (see column 6, lines 54-56 of Carlson). The icons are copied into an experiment design region 206 and associated with a specific device by a user through window 300 (see column 7, lines 11-20 of Carlson). Because the user is responsible for linking the external device and software module therefore to the experiment design window 200, clearly Carlson does not teach or suggest automatically linking the experiment design window 200 (development means) and the software module for the external device (see column 7 lines 21-36 of Carlson). By contrast, the present invention automatically links the development means to the software modules for external devices, thus simplifying program development for the external device.

Thus, the combination of Carlson and Takizawa fails to teach or suggest all limitations of amended claims 1 and 15. Accordingly, *prima facie* obviousness has not been established and the rejection of those claims, as well as dependent claims 2-14, is erroneous and should be withdrawn.

The Official Action rejected claims 3 and 13 as unpatentable over Carlson in view of Takizawa and further in view of Kodosky et al. (US Patent 6,173,438, hereinafter Kodosky). That rejection is respectfully traversed.

Kodosky fails to teach or suggest those limitations of amended claim 1 that are absent from the combination of Carlson and Takizawa, as previously discussed. Accordingly, the combination of Carlson, Takizawa, and Kodosky cannot teach or suggest claims 3 and 13, which inherit the limitations of amended claim 1.

Furthermore, the Official Action erroneously contends that Kodosky teaches a development means acquiring the software modules from the object. Kodosky plainly states that the host system transfers software drivers to the embedded system (see column 13, lines 52-55 of Kodosky). Thus, the development means (host LabVIEW, see Abstract) clearly does not need to acquire the software modules assigned to the embedded system from the embedded system, since the host LabVIEW transferred the software modules to the embedded system originally.

The Official Action rejected claim 14 as unpatentable over Carlson in view of Takizawa and further in view of Kang (US Patent 6,279,049) That rejection is respectfully traversed.

Kang fails to teach or suggest those limitations of amended claim 1 that are absent from the combination of Carlson and Takizawa, as previously discussed. Accordingly, the combination of Carlson, Takizawa, and Kang cannot teach or suggest claim 14, which inherits the limitations of amended claim 1.

In re Appln. of NAKAI et al.
Application No. 09/845,361

Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-15 is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



A. Wesley Ferreebee, Reg. No. 51,312
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER
700 Thirteenth Street, N.W., Suite 300
Washington, DC 20005-3960
(202) 737-6770 (telephone)
(202) 737-6776 (facsimile)

Date: _____

AWF/tps

Amendment or ROA - Regular (Revised 9/03/03)

1/23/04